

# Dynamical sensitivity of recurrence and transience of branching random walks

Sebastian Müller

December 7, 2009

## Abstract

Consider a sequence of i.i.d. random variables  $X_n$  where each random variable is refreshed independently according to a Poisson clock. At any fixed time  $t$  the law of the sequence is the same as for the sequence at time 0 but at random times almost sure properties of the sequence may be violated. If there are such *exceptional times* we say that the property is *dynamically sensitive*, otherwise we call it *dynamically stable*. In this note we consider branching random walks on Cayley graphs and prove that recurrence and transience are dynamically stable in the sub- and supercritical regime. While the critical case is left open in general we prove dynamical stability for a specific class of Cayley graphs. Our proof combines techniques from the theory of branching random walks with those of dynamical percolation.

KEYWORDS: BRANCHING RANDOM WALK, RECURRENCE AND TRANSIENCE, DYNAMICAL SENSITIVITY

AMS 2000 MATHEMATICS SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION: 60J25, 60J80

## 1 Introduction

In Benjamini et al. [1] several properties of i.i.d. sequences are studied in the dynamical point of view. In particular, it is proven that transience of the simple random walk on the lattice  $\mathbb{Z}^d$  is dynamically stable for  $d \geq 5$ , and dynamically sensitive for  $d = 3, 4$ . While recurrence is dynamically stable for  $d = 1$ , see [1], it is dynamically sensitive in dimension  $d = 2$ , see Hoffman [8]. Khoshnevisan studied in [10] and [11] other properties of dynamical random walks. We also refer to a recent survey [13] on dynamical percolation. In this note we define dynamical branching random walks on Cayley graphs and study dynamical sensitivity of recurrence and transience, see Theorem 2.1.

### 1.1 Random Walks

Let us first collect the necessary notations for random walks on groups; for more details we refer to [14]. Let  $G$  be a finitely generated group with group identity  $e$ , the group operations are written multiplicatively (unless  $G$  is abelian). Let  $q$  be a probability measure on a finite

generating set of  $G$ . The random walk on  $G$  with law  $q$  is the Markov chain with state space  $G$  and transition probabilities  $p(x, y) = q(x^{-1}y)$  for  $x, y \in G$ . Equivalently, the process can be described on the product space  $(G, q)^{\mathbb{N}}$ : the  $n$ -th projections  $X_n$  of  $G^{\mathbb{N}}$  onto  $G$  constitute a sequence of independent  $G$ -valued random variables with common distribution  $q$ . Hence the random walk starting in  $x \in G$  can be described as

$$S_n = xX_1 \cdots X_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

If not mentioned otherwise the random walk starts in the group identity  $e$ . Let  $P$  denote the transition kernel of the random walk and  $p^{(n)}(x, y) = \mathbb{P}(S_n = y | S_0 = x)$  be the probability to go from  $x$  to  $y$  in  $n$  steps. We will assume the random walk to be irreducible, i.e., for all  $x, y$  there exists some  $k$  such that  $p^{(k)}(x, y) > 0$ . Denote  $G(x, y|z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p^{(n)}(x, y)z^n$  the corresponding generating functions. The inverse of the convergence radius of  $G(x, y|z)$  is denoted by  $\rho(P)$ . The spectral radius  $\rho(P)$  is also given as

$$\rho(P) = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( p^{(n)}(x, y) \right), \quad (1)$$

where the limsup is, due to the irreducibility of the random walk, independent of  $x$  and  $y$ .

## 1.2 Branching Random Walks

We use the interpretation of tree-indexed random walks, compare with [2], to define the branching random walk (BRW). Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a tree with root  $\mathbf{r}$ . For a vertex  $v$  of  $\mathcal{T}$  let  $|v|$  be the (graph) distance from  $v$  to the root  $\mathbf{r}$ . Let  $\mathcal{T}_n = \{v : |v| = n\}$  be the  $n$ -th level of the tree  $\mathcal{T}$ . We label the edges of  $\mathcal{T}$  with i.i.d. random variables with distribution  $q$ . The random variable  $X_v$  is the label of the edge  $\langle v^-, v \rangle$  where  $v^-$  is the unique predecessor of  $v$ , i.e.,  $|v^-| = |v| - 1$ . Define  $S_v = e \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{|v|} X_{v_i}$  where  $\langle v_0 = \mathbf{r}, v_1, \dots, v_{|v|} = v \rangle$  is the unique geodesic from  $\mathbf{r}$  to  $v$ . Note that the process is described on the product space  $(G, q)^{\mathcal{T}}$ .

A tree-indexed random walk becomes a BRW if the underlying tree is a realization of a Galton–Watson process with offspring distribution  $\mu = (\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots)$  and mean  $m = \sum_k k\mu_k$ . For ease of presentation we will assume that the Galton–Watson process survives almost surely, i.e.,  $\mu_0 = 0$ , and that  $m > 1$  in order to exclude the trivial case  $\mu_1 = 1$ . We say the BRW is *recurrent* if  $\mathbb{P}(S_v = 0 \text{ for infinitely many } v) = 1$  and *transient* if  $\mathbb{P}(S_v = 0 \text{ for infinitely many } v) = 0$ . Here  $\mathbb{P}$  does correspond to the product measure of the Galton–Watson process and the tree-indexed random walk: we pick a realization  $\mathcal{T}(\omega)$  of the Galton–Watson process according to  $\mu$  and define the BRW as the tree-indexed random walk on  $\mathcal{T}(\omega)$ . Alternatively we could say that the BRW is recurrent if for a.a. realization  $\mathcal{T}(\omega)$  the tree-indexed random walk is recurrent, i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v = e\} = \infty\right) = 1$ , where  $\mathbb{P}$  corresponds to  $(G, q)^{\mathcal{T}(\omega)}$ . Since we consider BRW on Cayley graphs the probability  $\mathbb{P}(S_v = 0 \text{ for infinitely many } v)$  is either 0 or 1, see [5]. Therefore, the BRW is either recurrent or transient.

We have the following classification due to [5]:

**Theorem 1.1.** *The BRW is transient if and only if  $m \leq 1/\rho(P)$ .*

*Remark 1.1.* There is the following equivalent description of BRW. At time 0 we start the process with one particle in  $e$ . At time 1 this particle splits up according to some offspring distribution  $\mu$ . Then these offspring particles move (still at time 1) independently according to  $P$ . The BRW is now defined inductively: at each time each particle splits up independently of the others according to  $\mu$  and the *new* particles move then independently according to  $P$ .

## 2 Dynamical BRW

Let us introduce the dynamical process. Fix a tree  $\mathcal{T}$ . For each  $v \in \mathcal{T}$ , let  $\{X_v(t)\}_{t \geq 0}$  be an independent process that updates its value by an independent sample of  $q$  with rate 1. Formally, consider i.i.d. random variables  $\{X_v^{(j)} : v \in \mathcal{T}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$  with law  $q$ , and an independent Poisson process  $\{\psi_v^{(j)}\}_{j \geq 0}$  of rate 1 for each  $v \in \mathcal{T}$ . Define

$$X_v(t) := X_v^{(j)} \text{ for } \psi_v^{(j-1)} \leq t < \psi_v^{(j)}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\psi_v^{(0)} = 0$  for every  $n$ . The distribution of  $(X_v(t))_{v \in \mathcal{T}}$  is  $q^{\mathcal{T}}$  for every  $t \geq 0$ . Denote  $\mathbf{P}$  the probability measure on the underlying probability space on which the dynamical BRW process is defined. In the following  $\mathbf{P}$ ,  $\mathbf{E}$  will always correspond to the dynamical version while  $\mathbb{P}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}$  describe the non-dynamical process.

Due to Theorem 1.1 we have with Fubini's Theorem

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} < \infty \text{ for Lebesgue-a.e. } t \right) = 1$$

if  $m \leq 1/\rho$  and

$$\mathbf{P} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} = \infty \text{ for Lebesgue-a.e. } t \right) = 1$$

if  $m > 1/\rho(P)$ . The result of this note is that there are no exceptional times for transience and recurrence of BRW in the sub-and supercritical regime. For the critical regime we assume an additional condition on the Cayley graph, but believe that transience is dynamically stable in general.

**Theorem 2.1.** *We consider a BRW on a Cayley graph  $G$  with law  $q$  and offspring distribution  $\mu$  (whose support excludes 0) and mean  $m > 1$ . Then:*

- if  $m \leq 1/\rho(P)$  and  $\sum_n np^{(n)}(e, e)m^n < \infty$  then

$$P \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} < \infty \text{ for all } t \right) = 1$$

- if  $m > 1/\rho(P)$  then

$$P\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} = \infty \text{ for all } t\right) = 1$$

*Remark 2.1.* Observe that  $m < 1/\rho(P)$  implies that  $\sum_n np^{(n)}(e, e)m^n < \infty$ . The later condition does in general not hold in the critical case, i.e.,  $m = 1/\rho(P)$ : we only have that  $\sum_n p^{(n)}(e, e)m^n < \infty$  for random walks on nonamenable Cayley graphs. The condition depends on the nonexponential type of the return probabilities; if  $p^{(n)}(e, e) \sim \rho(P)^n n^{-\lambda}$  we speak of  $n^{-\lambda}$  as the nonexponential type of return probabilities. While the simple random walk on the homogeneous tree does not satisfies the condition, various random walks on free products with  $\lambda > 2$  are presented in [4].

*Remark 2.2.* In Theorem 2.1 the Galton–Watson tree is fixed for all  $t \geq 0$  and only the increments of the tree-indexed random walk are dependent on  $t$ . One may use a *dynamical* version of the Galton–Watson process to define a dynamical BRW. To do this, let  $Y(t)$  be a dynamical random variable with values in  $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$  defined as in Equation (2) and  $(Y_{n,i}(t))_{n,i \geq 1}$  be independent random variables distributed like  $Y(t)$ . We define the dynamical Galton–Watson process as

$$Z_1(t) = 1 \text{ and } Z_{n+1}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n(t)} Y_{n,i}(t) \text{ for } n \geq 1.$$

Every Galton–Watson process  $Z_n(t)$  gives rise to a Galton–Watson tree  $\mathcal{T}(t)$  which enables us to define a dynamical BRW such that the distribution of  $(X_v(t))_{v \in \mathcal{T}(t)}$  is  $q^{\mathcal{T}(t)}$  for every  $t \geq 0$ . The proof of Theorem 2.1 generalizes to this version of dynamical BRW. Observe hereby that one not only has to take care about the values of  $X_v$ ’s along certain geodesics but also about the existence of these geodesics during some time intervals.

*Remark 2.3.* A multi-type Galton–Watson process is a generalization of the standard Galton–Watson process where one distinguishes between different types of particles. The different types are normally encoded by the natural numbers. The process is described by  $Z_n = (Z_n(1), Z_n(2), \dots)$  where  $Z_n(k)$  denotes the number of particles of type  $k$  at time  $n$ . For  $k \geq 1$  let  $Y^{(k)} = (Y^{(k)}(1), Y^{(k)}(2), \dots)$  be random variables in  $\{\mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ . Say we start the process with one particle of type 1, i.e.,  $Z_1 = (1, 0, 0, \dots)$ , then the multi-type Galton–Watson process is defined inductively by

$$Z_{n+1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n(k)} Y_{n,i}^{(k)} \text{ for all } n \geq 1,$$

where  $(Y_{n,i}^{(k)})_{n,i \geq 1}$  are independent random variables distributed like  $Y^{(k)}$ . For ease of presentation we assume first that the process survives almost sure, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} Y^{(k)}(i) > 1$  almost sure for all  $k$ . Furthermore, we assume the multi-type Galton–Watson process to be irreducible, i.e., for all  $k$  there exists some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the probability that  $Z_n(k) > 0$  is positive.

A BRW on a Cayley graph can be viewed as a multi-type Galton–Watson process: the position  $x \in G$  of a particle is interpreted as its type. In this case the types are encoded by elements of  $G$ . Recurrence of a BRW on a Cayley graph means that each site  $x$  is visited infinitely many times almost sure. This is equivalent to say that the corresponding multi-type Galton–Watson process survives locally:  $\mathbb{P}(Z_n(x) > 0 \text{ for infinitely many } n) = 1$ . If we leave the homogeneous setting of BRW on Cayley graphs and consider BRW on a general graph the probability that infinitely many particles return to the starting position may be strictly between 0 and 1, compare with [5]. We say the BRW is transient if the latter probability is 0 and recurrent if it is positive. The corresponding phenomenon occurs for multi-type Galton–Watson processes too. We say there is local survival if  $\mathbb{P}(Z_n(k) > 0 \text{ for infinitely many } n) > 0$ . Due to the irreducibility of the process the latter probability is either positive for all  $k$  or equal to 0 for all  $k$  and we can speak of local extinction if  $\mathbb{P}(Z_n(k) > 0 \text{ for infinitely many } n) = 0$  for all (some)  $k$ , compare with [6].

It is straightforward to define a dynamical multi-type Galton–Watson process analogously to the dynamical Galton–Watson process defined in Remark 2.2. One might wonder if there are exceptional times for local survival and local extinction. Now, let us drop the assumption that the process survives almost surely. We speak of global survival if  $Z_n > 0$  for infinitely many  $n$  with positive probability and of global extinction otherwise. The treatment of global survival is in general more difficult and even more subtle since *critical* processes may survive or die out, compare with [3]. Therefore the study of exceptional times for global survival/extinction is one of the next steps to go.

*Remark 2.4.* Let us consider a transient random walk  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$  on  $\mathbb{Z}$  (or  $\mathbb{R}$ ) with  $\mathbb{E}[X_i] > 0$ . We assume that there exists a rate function  $I(\cdot)$  satisfying

$$-I(a) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \mathbb{P}(S_n \leq an) \text{ for } a \leq \mathbb{E}[X_i].$$

Denote by  $m_n$  the minimal position of a particle at time  $n$ ;  $m_n = \min_{|v|=n} S_v$ . There is the classical result that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_n}{n} = \inf\{s : I(s) \leq \log m\}$ . Combining the proof of Theorem 18.3 in [12] with the ideas of the proof of Theorem 2.1 one can see that there are no exceptional times for the (linear) speed, i.e.,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{m_n(t)}{n} = \inf\{s : I(s) \leq \log m\}$  for all  $t$ . Furthermore, in the critical case  $m = 1/\rho(P)$  we have that  $m_n/n \rightarrow 0$  but  $m_n \rightarrow \infty$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . The *second order* behaviour is more subtle: while for a wide range of BRW  $m_n/\log n$  converges in probability it does in general not converge almost surely. We refer to [9] for more details and references on recent results. In this respect the study of exceptional times for the second order behaviour is of interest.

### 3 Proof of Theorem 2.1

*Transience is dynamically stable if  $\sum np^{(n)}(e, e)m^n < \infty$ :* It is convenient to define an auxiliary random variable  $\tau$ , which is exponentially distributed with mean 1 and independent of

$(X_v(t))_{v \in \mathcal{T}, t \geq 0}$ , see Section 3 in [1]. Define

$$\mathcal{Z}_n := \int_0^\tau \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} dt.$$

By Fubini's Theorem we have  $\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{Z}_n] = m^n p^{(n)}(e, e)$ . We follow the line of proof of Lemma 5.6 in [1]. In what follows we only consider those  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(S_n = e) > 0$ . We have for  $n \geq 1$

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n > 0) = \frac{\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{Z}_n]}{\mathbf{E}[\mathcal{Z}_n | \mathcal{Z}_n > 0]}.$$

Let  $\sigma := \inf\{t \geq 0 : S_v(t) = e \text{ for some } v \in \mathcal{T}_n\}$ . There might be several  $v$  such that  $S_v(\sigma) = e$ . In order to choose one of them we use an enumeration of the vertices of  $\mathcal{T}_n$ . This enumeration is chosen once for  $t = 0$  and remains fixed for  $t \geq 0$ . Define the random set  $R = \{v \in \mathcal{T}_n : S_v(\sigma) = e\}$  and let  $\tilde{v}$  be the smallest (in the above enumeration) element of  $R$ . Furthermore, denote  $\langle \mathbf{r}, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_n = \tilde{v} \rangle$  the geodesic from  $\mathbf{r}$  to  $\tilde{v}$ . For any geodesic  $\langle \mathbf{r}, v \rangle = \langle \mathbf{r}, v_1, \dots, v_n = v \rangle$  we define the event

$$A(\langle \mathbf{r}, v \rangle) = \{X_{v_k}, 1 \leq k \leq n, \text{ do not change their values during } [\sigma, \sigma + 1/n]\}.$$

Since the event that  $X_{v_k}$  changes its value during  $[\sigma, \sigma + 1/n]$  is independent of its value at time  $\sigma$  we have that  $\mathbf{P}(A(\langle \mathbf{r}, v \rangle) | \sigma < \infty) = 1/e$ .

Conditioned on the event  $\{\mathcal{Z}_n > 0\}$  we have  $\sigma \in [0, \tau)$ . By the strong Markov property and the *memoryless* property of  $\tau$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\tau > \sigma + 1/n, \exists v : S_v(t) = e \forall t \in [\sigma, \sigma + 1/n] | \mathcal{Z}_n > 0) \\ \geq \mathbf{P}(\tau > \sigma + 1/n, A(\langle \mathbf{r}, \tilde{v} \rangle) | \mathcal{Z}_n > 0) = \left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{1/n} \frac{1}{e}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

If the above event occurs, then  $\mathcal{Z}_n \geq 1/n$ . Hence

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n \geq 1/n | \mathcal{Z}_n > 0) \geq 1/e^2 \text{ and } \mathbf{E}[\mathcal{Z}_n | \mathcal{Z}_n > 0] \geq \frac{1}{ne^2}.$$

Eventually,

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n > 0) \leq e^2 n p^{(n)}(e, e) m^n \quad \forall n,$$

and hence  $\sum_n \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{Z}_n > 0) < \infty$ . By the lemma of Borel–Cantelli there are no times  $t$  such that  $\sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} > 0$  for infinitely many  $n$  and therefore

$$\mathbf{P}(\exists t : \sum_n \sum_{|v|=n} \mathbf{1}\{S_v(t) = e\} = \infty) = 0.$$

*Recurrence is dynamically stable:* Let us first consider the non-dynamical BRW. Since  $m > 1/\rho(P)$  we have with equation (1) that there exists some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $p^{(k)}(e, e)m^k > 1$ . It's rather standard, e.g. compare with proof of Theorem 18.3 in [12], to define the following

embedded process  $(\xi_n)_{n \geq 1}$  where we observe the process only at times  $ik$ ,  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ , and kill all particles that are not in  $e$  at these times. Then  $\xi_n$  describes the number of particles at  $e$  at time  $nk$ . Let us give a more formal definition of this process. Let  $\mathcal{T}^v$  be the induced subgraph of  $\mathcal{T}$  consisting of all descendants of  $v$ , or in other words, of all vertices whose geodesic to the root goes through  $v$ . Furthermore, let  $\mathcal{T}_k^v = \{w \in \mathcal{T}^v : d(v, w) = k\}$  be the vertices at level  $k$  of  $\mathcal{T}^v$  and denote by  $v^{-k}$  the  $k$ -th predecessor of  $v$ , i.e.,  $v \in \mathcal{T}^{v^{-k}}$  and  $d(v^{-k}, v) = k$ . Define

$$Y_v = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{T}_k^v} \mathbf{1}\{S_w = S_v\}.$$

Let  $H_1 = \{\mathbf{r}\}$  and define inductively for  $n \geq 1$

$$H_{n+1} = \{v : |v| = nk, S_v = e, S_{v^{-k}} \in H_n\}.$$

Then  $\xi_n = |H_n|$  but can also be written as

$$\xi_{n+1} = \sum_{v \in H_n} Y_v.$$

Since the  $((Y_v)_{v \in \mathcal{T}_{ik}})_{i \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. random variables the process  $\xi_n$  has the same law as the Galton–Watson process  $(Z_n)_{n \geq 1}$  defined through  $Z_1 = 1$  and  $Z_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n} Y_{n,i}$ , where  $(Y_{n,i})_{n,i \geq 1}$  are i.i.d. random variables distributed like  $Y_v$ . Since  $\mathbb{E}[Y_v] = p^{(k)}(e, e)m^k > 1$  the process  $Z_n$  is a supercritical Galton–Watson process and hence survives with positive probability and so does  $\xi_n$ .

The dynamical version of the BRW induces a dynamical version of  $\xi_n$ : Let  $H_1(t) = \{\mathbf{r}\}$  and define inductively

$$H_{n+1}(t) = \{v : |v| = nk, S_v(t) = e, S_{v^{-k}}(t) \in H_n(t)\}.$$

Let  $\xi_n(t) = |H_n(t)|$  which can also be written as

$$\xi_{n+1}(t) = \sum_{v \in H_n(t)} Y_v(t)$$

where

$$Y_v(t) = \sum_{w \in \mathcal{T}_k^v} \mathbf{1}\{S_w(t) = S_v(t)\}.$$

Again, with  $(Y_{n,i}(t))_{n,i \geq 1}$  i.i.d. like  $Y_v(t)$  the Galton–Watson process defined by  $Z_1(t) = 1$  and

$$Z_{n+1}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{Z_n(t)} Y_{n,i}(t),$$

has the same law as  $\xi_n(t)$ .

As before  $\mathbb{P}$  denotes the probability measure for the non-dynamical process while  $\mathbf{P}$  describes the dynamical version. Analogously to the study of the noncritical cases in [7] let

$$\inf_{[a,b]} H_n = \bigcap_{t \in [a,b]} H_n(t) \text{ and } \inf_{[a,b]} \xi_n = |\inf_{[a,b]} H_n|.$$

With

$$\inf_{[a,b]} Y_v = \sum_{w \in T_k^v} \mathbf{1}\{S_w(t) = S_v(t) \ \forall t \in [a, b]\}$$

we can write

$$\inf_{[a,b]} \xi_n = \sum \inf_{[a,b]} Y_v, \text{ where the sum is over } v \in \inf_{[a,b]} H_{n-1}.$$

As above, the process  $\inf_{[a,b]} \xi_n$  is a Galton–Watson process with mean  $\mathbf{E}[\inf_{[a,b]} Y_v]$ . In order to show that there exists some  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\mathbf{E}[\inf_{[0,\varepsilon]} Y_v] > 1$  we proceed analogously to the arguments around Equation (3). Let  $R_v = \{w \in T_k^v : S_w(0) = S_v(0)\}$ . Condition on the fact that  $|R_v| \geq l$  let  $w_1, \dots, w_l$  be the  $l$  smallest (according to some enumeration of the vertices) elements of  $R_v$ . Observe

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\inf_{[0,\varepsilon]} Y_v \geq l) &\geq \mathbf{P}(|R_v| \geq l) \mathbf{P}(S_{w_i}(t) = S_{w_i}(0) \ \forall t \in [0, \varepsilon], 1 \leq i \leq l \mid |R_v| \geq l) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(Y_v \geq l) \left(\frac{1}{e}\right)^{\varepsilon kl} \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality comes from the consideration of the *worst case* where the geodesics  $\langle \mathbf{r}, w_i \rangle$  are disjoint (except of  $\mathbf{r}$ ).

Eventually, since  $\mathbb{E}[Y_v] > 1$  we can choose  $\varepsilon > 0$  such that  $\mathbf{E}[\inf_{[0,\varepsilon]} Y_{n,i}] > 1$ . Hence, the Galton–Watson process  $\inf_{[0,\varepsilon]} \xi_n$  is supercritical and there are no exceptional times in the interval  $[0, \varepsilon]$ . Repeating the arguments for the intervals  $[k\varepsilon, (k+1)\varepsilon]$  and using countable additivity concludes the proof for  $m > 1$ .

**Acknowledgment:** Thanks to Itai Benjamini for suggesting this problem and introducing me to the concept of dynamical sensitivity. The author wishes to thank a referee for helpful suggestions and for bringing to his attention several inaccuracies.

## References

- [1] Itai Benjamini, Olle Häggström, Yuval Peres, and Jeffrey E. Steif. Which properties of a random sequence are dynamically sensitive? *Ann. Probab.*, 31(1):1–34, 2003.
- [2] Itai Benjamini and Yuval Peres. Markov chains indexed by trees. *Ann. Probab.*, 22(1):219–243, 1994.
- [3] Daniela Bertacchi and Fabio Zucca. Characterization of the critical values of branching random walks on weighted graphs through infinite-type branching processes, arXiv:0804.0224v1.
- [4] Elisabetta Candellero and Lorenz A. Gilch. Phase transitions for random walk asymptotics on free products of groups, arXiv:0909.1893v2.



- [5] Nina Gantert and Sebastian Müller. The critical branching Markov chain is transient. *Markov Process. and Rel. Fields.*, 12:805–814, 2006.
- [6] Nina Gantert, Sebastian Müller, Serguei Popov, and Marina Vachkovskaia. Survival of branching random walks in random environment. *to appear in Journal of Theoretical Probability*, DOI 10.1007/s10959-009-0227-5, 2009+.
- [7] Olle Häggström, Yuval Peres, and Jeffrey E. Steif. Dynamical percolation. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.*, 33(4):497–528, 1997.
- [8] Christopher Hoffman. Recurrence of simple random walk on  $\mathbb{Z}^2$  is dynamically sensitive. *ALEA Lat. Am. J. Probab. Math. Stat.*, 1:35–45 (electronic), 2006.
- [9] Yueyun Hu and Zhan Shi. Minimal position and critical martingale convergence in branching random walks, and directed polymers on disordered trees. *Annals of Probability*, to appear in.
- [10] Davar Khoshnevisan, David A. Levin, and Pedro J. Méndez-Hernández. On dynamical Gaussian random walks. *Ann. Probab.*, 33(4):1452–1478, 2005.
- [11] Davar Khoshnevisan, David A. Levin, and Pedro J. Méndez-Hernández. Exceptional times and invariance for dynamical random walks. *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, 134(3):383–416, 2006.
- [12] Yuval Peres. Probability on trees: an introductory climb. In *Lectures on probability theory and statistics (Saint-Flour, 1997)*, volume 1717 of *Lecture Notes in Math.*, pages 193–280. Springer, Berlin, 1999.
- [13] Jeffrey E. Steif. A survey on dynamical percolation. *arXiv:0901.4760*, 2008++.
- [14] Wolfgang Woess. *Random walks on infinite graphs and groups*, volume 138 of *Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.